



UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE
United States Patent and Trademark Office
Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS
P.O. Box 1450
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450
www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
-----------------	-------------	----------------------	---------------------	------------------

10/619,917

07/15/2003

Christopher J. Allen

10761.1457

7149

81331 7590 10/02/2009

Accenture/Finnegan, Henderson,
Farabow, Garrett & Dunner, LLP
901 New York Avenue
Washington, DC 20001-4413

EXAMINER

STACE, BRENT S

ART UNIT

PAPER NUMBER

2161

NOTIFICATION DATE

DELIVERY MODE

10/02/2009

ELECTRONIC

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

The time period for reply, if any, is set in the attached communication.

Notice of the Office communication was sent electronically on above-indicated "Notification Date" to the following e-mail address(es):

betty.finley@finnegan.com
dianna.williams@finnegan.com
catherine.vanhouten@finnegan.com

Interview Summary	Application No. 10/619,917	Applicant(s) ALLEN ET AL.	
	Examiner BRENT STACE	Art Unit 2161	

All participants (applicant, applicant's representative, PTO personnel):

(1) BRENT STACE. (3) Michael Sonaya.

(2) Robert Converse. (4) ____.

Date of Interview: 28 September 2009.

Type: a) ☒ Telephonic b) ☐ Video Conference
c) ☐ Personal [copy given to: 1) ☐ applicant 2) ☐ applicant's representative]

Exhibit shown or demonstration conducted: d) ☐ Yes e) ☒ No.
If Yes, brief description: _____.

Claim(s) discussed: 1.

Identification of prior art discussed: McFarlane, Shaffer, Kaish.

Agreement with respect to the claims f) ☐ was reached. g) ☒ was not reached. h) ☐ N/A.

Substance of Interview including description of the general nature of what was agreed to if an agreement was reached, or any other comments: Applicant's discussed that the invention is allegedly different from Shaffer since the invention does selective synchronization. Discussed possibly amending the claims to show a rule-based selective synchronization that may overcome Shaffer. No agreement was reached with respect to the claims.

(A fuller description, if necessary, and a copy of the amendments which the examiner agreed would render the claims allowable, if available, must be attached. Also, where no copy of the amendments that would render the claims allowable is available, a summary thereof must be attached.)

THE FORMAL WRITTEN REPLY TO THE LAST OFFICE ACTION MUST INCLUDE THE SUBSTANCE OF THE INTERVIEW. (See MPEP Section 713.04). If a reply to the last Office action has already been filed, APPLICANT IS GIVEN A NON-EXTENDABLE PERIOD OF THE LONGER OF ONE MONTH OR THIRTY DAYS FROM THIS INTERVIEW DATE, OR THE MAILING DATE OF THIS INTERVIEW SUMMARY FORM, WHICHEVER IS LATER, TO FILE A STATEMENT OF THE SUBSTANCE OF THE INTERVIEW. See Summary of Record of Interview requirements on reverse side or on attached sheet.

/BRENT STACE/ Examiner, Art Unit 2161	/Apu M Mofiz/ Supervisory Patent Examiner, Art Unit 2161
------------------------------------------	-------------------------------------------------------------